

REMARKS

The outstanding Official Action and the art relied upon therein have carefully been considered and amendments deemed appropriate have been made to the specification, drawings and claims of this application as set forth above.

The title and abstract have been amended to reflect the invention as elected and as required by the examiner.

The drawings have been corrected to overcome the objections expressed thereto expressed in the outstanding Official Action. The numbers 72 and 80 have been inserted in the new drawings. From their description in the specification it is clear to which elements of the drawings these refer. As for the reference numerals 31 and 53 referred to in paragraph 5 of the Official Action, the reference number 53 as originally appearing has been deleted from Fig. 3 and the tube incorrectly identified as numeral 60 has been renumbered "53." Page 15 of the specification has been amended accordingly. Reference numeral 31 has also been added in the specification at page 15, line 19, consistent with the occurrence of the numeral 31 in Figs. 1 and 2. With these corrections the examiner's objections to drawings are believed overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claims 29 - 31 over Hirschberger under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and over Nakagawa et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), independent claim 29 has been amended to emphasize the relationship of the die to the two gear pumps of the coextrusion system that effects alternate polymer extrusion. It is clear from claim 29 as now amended that the result is a substantial reduction or elimination of the drool that adversely affects the changeover from one polymer to another.

Neither Hirschberger nor Nakagawa et al. teach the prevention of drool in an alternate polymer coextrusion process under the control of two gear pumps. Neither describes a die with


polymer flow paths constricted for the improvement of drool reduction that is the end result of this invention. Hirschberger does not relate to a "continuous extrusion system." Also the constriction of Nakagawa et al. at 34 and 35 in Fig. 11 is not "of fixed dimension."

Claims 30 and 31 are dependent from parent claim 29 and are believed allowable over the art of record with claim 29 based on the distinctions discussed herein above with respect to claim 29. It is respectfully urged that each of the claims 29 -31 now under consideration in this application are allowable as of this time and favorable reconsideration to that end is respectfully solicited.

Should the examiner in charge of the application have questions or suggestions in regard to the application, he is invited to call or email the undersigned attorney for applicant at the telephone number or email address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/3/03

By 
Thomas D. MacBlain
Attorneys for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,583

Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225
(602) 530-8088
tdm@gknet.com